



**AGENDA
CITY OF BRYAN
HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION
Thursday, 21 April 2005**

**Special Meeting – 12:15 p.m.
Council Chambers of the Municipal Building, 300 S. Texas Avenue**

1. Call to Order
2. Recognition of Visitors
3. Citizens to Be Heard on Items Not on Agenda
4. Recognition of Affidavits for Conflict of Interest
5. Public Hearing and Consideration for **200 S. Main Street**
Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations
6. Commissioner and Staff Concerns
 - A. Individual Commissioners' Concerns
 - B. Items for Upcoming Agendas
7. Adjournment

04/21/2005
STATE OF TEXAS
COUNTY OF BRAZOS
CITY OF BRYAN

On the 21st day of April 2005, the Historic Landmark Commission of the City of Bryan convened in an open session of a special meeting in the City Council Chambers of the Bryan Municipal Building at 12:15 p.m. with the following in attendance:

| Member | Today | Since Apptmt. | Since Apptmt. | Attended | Last 6 Mths | Last 6 Mths | Last 6 Mths |
|----------------|-------|---------------|---------------|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Dawn Jourdan | Yes | 5 | 5 | 100% | * | * | * |
| James Ferguson | Yes | 5 | 5 | 100% | * | * | * |
| Jim Hiney | No | 28 | 27 | 96% | 5 | 4 | 80% |
| Chad Grauke | Yes | 5 | 4 | 80% | * | * | * |
| George Hester | No | 16 | 14 | 88% | 5 | 4 | 80% |
| James Crawley | Yes | 5 | 4 | 80% | * | * | * |
| Sheila Fields | No | 5 | 4 | 80% | * | * | * |

Staff member present: Katie Blanchard, Downtown Project Planner

1. Call To Order

Commissioner Jourdan called the meeting to order at 12:33 pm.

2. Recognition Of Visitors

There were none.

3. Citizens To Be Heard

There were none.

4. Recognition Of Affidavits Filed In Response To State Law On Disclosure Of Local Official's Conflict Of Interest

There were none.

5. Public Hearing/Consideration – Certificate of Appropriateness for 200 South Main Street

Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations

Katie Blanchard, Downtown Project Planner, presented the staff report (on file in Planning Services). Ms. Blanchard informed the Commission that on February 23, 2005, the Commission approved the design of two external staircases to be added to the south and north facades of the building. Ms. Blanchard informed the Commission that the applicant has since requested to change the handrail design of the stairs. Ms. Blanchard informed the Commission that the proposed exterior stair design is similar to other recently constructed staircases found in the District and that the design of the proposed stair is appropriate, and staff recommends approval of the requested alterations.

The Commission discuss the following with staff:

1. Why the change was requested; and,

Staff responded that the change was requested because the applicant noticed that the ironwork for the proposed stairs was similar to the ironwork on the fence surrounding the Planned Parenthood facility.

2. Are there design guidelines for stair railings; and

Staff responded that there were only general guidelines for new additions, but the Commission can make aesthetic determinations regarding COA requests.

3. Staff reports should reflect actual conditions and precedents in the area, and minimize the use of standard language

Staff requested clarification as to what language in the report was objectionable.

4. Will the applicant be submitting additional requests?

Staff affirmed that applicants will submit an additional proposal.

The public hearing was opened.

The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Ferguson made a motion to table the COA for 200 South Main, and Commissioner Crawley seconded the motion.

The Commission discussed the following:

1. The proposed revision is utilitarian and appears to have been proposed to save money; and,
2. The proposed alteration eliminates decorative elements at the landings; and,
3. Staff's contention of similar stairs in the area is exaggerated because only one staircase in the area is similar to the one being proposed which is located in the back of the Hotel Charles; and,
4. The building is very prominent and so is staircase, similar to the Conlee Building; and,
5. Most stairs in the District are very utilitarian and non-code compliant; and,
6. Staircases which are exceptions to the utilitarian, noncompliant standard include the stairs on the building at 201 North Main, and the other is the stairs originally proposed for the subject property; and,
7. Architectural detail elements enhance the historic character; and,
8. The Commission had previously applauded the applicant for including decorative elements in the staircase design and it is disappointing to see them removed; and,
9. The Commission role is almost strictly aesthetic; and,
10. Astin Building's stairs were approved without close examination, and the stairs on that building will not be aesthetically pleasing; and,
11. The lax review of proposals should not be repeated and should not serve as a precedent in future reviews; and,
12. Better guidelines should be created to evaluate COA proposals; and,
13. All ironwork in the District has decorative elements except the Charles Hotel; and,
14. Proposed staircase design is a disappointment and is a step backwards from a design standpoint; and,
15. The staircase could be redesigned in a more appealing manner without substantially impacting cost; and,
16. This is the second submittal without representation by the clients or their agent and this is disturbing; and,
17. Questions and issues related to this project would be easier to resolve if the applicants or their agents were present; and,
18. Should the applicant be informed of the reasons the proposal was tabled?

Commissioner Grauke made an amendment to the motion to table the proposal to notify the applicant of the reasons the submittal was tabled, which included failure of the applicant to appear and answer questions and the absence of decorative elements on the proposed staircase.

The motion was passed with a unanimous vote.

6. Commissioner And Staff Concerns

A. Individual Commissioner's Concerns

Commissioner Grauke informed the Commission that submittals should be fully examined and staff should be careful with the language included in reports, and help the Commission identify precedents and/or irregularities related to proposals.

Commissioner Jourdan stated that the language in the current ordinance should be copied verbatim so Commissioners can review the wording to determine if and how it should be amended. Commissioner Jourdan also stated that reviewing the current provisions of the ordinance may require a Commission workshop.

B. Items for Upcoming Agendas

Staff stated that there were no upcoming agenda items.

7. Adjournment

Commissioner Grauke made the motion to adjourn, and the motion was seconded by Commissioner Crawley.

There being no other business, the April 21st Special Meeting of the Historic Landmark Commission adjourned at 1:02 pm.

THESE MINUTES SHALL SERVE AS THE OFFICIAL FINDINGS OF THE HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION, AS APPROVED THIS 8th DAY OF JUNE, 2005.

Signature of File

Chairperson of the Historic Landmark Commission